



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,234	09/25/2003	Neil Rhodes	2003P14811US	8197
7590 Siemens Corporation Intellectual Property Department 170 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830		EXAMINER BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R		
		ART UNIT 2446		
		MAIL DATE 08/17/2009		
		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,234

Applicant(s)

RHODES ET AL.

Examiner

BENJAMIN R. BRUCKART

Art Unit

2446

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CD/CD)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

Detailed Action

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-20 are pending in this Office Action.

No new, amended or cancelled claims.

Response to Arguments

In view of the appeal brief filed on 6/8/09, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

A new grounds of rejection on claim 4 is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, applicant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then applicant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano.

Regarding claim 1, the Prokupets reference teaches a data transmission system for a facility (Prokupets: Fig. 1) comprising:

- a first network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24) including;
- a number of critical devices disposed within the facility (Prokupets: page 3, para 24); and
- at least one first computer workstation operably coupled to said number of critical devices via said first network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 12);
- at least one second computer workstation (Prokupets: Fig. 2, tag 24);

The Prokupets reference teaches fails to teach a router to configure to receive, store and forward data packets.

However, the Asano reference teaches an isolating router coupling said first network to a second network and operable to isolate said first network from data transmission traffic in said second network (Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11), the isolating router comprising a router configured to receive and store data packets, and to forward the received data packets (Asano: col. 16, lines 58– col. 17 line 11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the invention of Prokupets to include an isolating router that processes packets as taught by Asano in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

Regarding claim 2, the data transmission system of claim 1, wherein:

said first network is a fire control network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24);

said number of critical devices include fire control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24); and

said first computer workstation implements software configured to receive data from and transmit data to said fire control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24; events and commands).

Regarding claim 7, the data transmission system of claim 1, wherein:

said second network includes a corporate network, independent of said first network, which includes workstations capable of broadcast transmissions (Prokupets: page 1, para 1); and

said isolating router is operable to block said broadcast transmissions to said first network (Prokupets: page 1, para 4; Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 14, the Prokupets reference teaches a data communication system for a facility comprising a first network and a second network connected by a router (Prokupets: Fig. 1), the first network including a first plurality of work stations (Prokupets: Fig. 1; page 3, para 24), a second plurality of work stations (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 26, 30), the first plurality of workstations including only building system workstations, the second plurality of work stations including only non-fire safety related building system workstations and non-building system workstations (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 12; page 3, para 21, 24), and wherein the router enables communication between the non-fire related building system workstations and the first plurality of workstations.

The Prokupets reference teaches fails to teach an IP router.

However, the Asano reference teaches an IP router coupling said first network to said second network and operable to isolate said first network from data transmission traffic in said second network (Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11), and the router is operable to disable communication between the non-building system workstations and the first plurality of workstations (Asano: col. 16, lines 58– col. 17 line 11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the invention of Prokupets to include an isolating router that processes packets as taught by Asano in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

Regarding claim 15, the data communication system of claim 14 wherein at least one building system work station is a fire safety system workstation connected to one of a plurality of fire safety system devices (Prokupets: page 5, para 34-35).

Regarding claim 16, the data communication system of claim 14 wherein the first plurality of workstations includes at least one fire safety system workstation and at least one non-fire building system work station (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 18a, tag 30, tag 24; page 4, para 28).

Regarding claim 17, the data communication system of claim 14 wherein at least one of the non-fire building system workstations is operably connected to heating ventilation and air conditioning system devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22a).

Claims 3, 4, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No 20060114842 by Miyamoto et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,736 by Koenig et al.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data transmission system of claim 2. The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches an Ethernet switch used to isolate a first network from a second network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed devices.

However, the Koenig reference teaches using one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards on hardware (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 8, the modified Prokupets reference teaches a data transmission system for use in a facility (Prokupets: Fig. 1) comprising:

- a first network including a number of fire control devices and a number of fire safety workstations operably coupled to said fire control devices and operable to implement software for maintaining and controlling said fire control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24);

- a number of building control devices and a number of building automation workstations operably coupled to said building control devices and operable to implement software for maintaining and controlling said building control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 26, 30).

The Prokupets reference teaches fails to teach an IP router.

However, the Asano reference teaches an isolating router coupling said first network to said second network and operable to isolate said first network from data transmission traffic in

said second network (Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the invention of Prokupets to include an isolating router that processes packets as taught by Asano in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches an Ethernet switch used to isolate a first network from a second network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed.

However, the Koenig reference teaches using UL certification on hardware (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 9, the data transmission system of claim 8, wherein said building automation workstations include a database server workstation and at least one database client workstation (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tags 14, 30).

Regarding claim 10, the data transmission system of claim 9, wherein database server workstation is connected within said first sub-network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 12).

Regarding claim 11, modified Prokupets reference the data transmission system of claim 10.

The Prokupets reference fails to teach standards on equipment.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for fire protective signaling uses than at least some workstations connected outside the first sub-network (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 12, modified Prokupets reference the data transmission system of claim 11.

The Prokupets reference fails to teach standards on equipment.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for fire protective signaling uses (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 13, modified Prokupets reference the data transmission system of claim 12.

The Prokupets reference fails to teach standards on equipment.

However, the Koenig reference teaches a meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for information technology equipment for fire protective signaling uses (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Claims 5-6, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No 20060114842 by Miyamoto et al.

Regarding claim 5, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data transmission system of claim 1. The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches a second network includes a building control network which includes a second Ethernet switch operably coupled to a number of building control devices independent of said operationally critical devices (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

Regarding claim 6, the data transmission system of claim 5, wherein:

said second network includes a corporate network, independent of said building control network, which includes workstations capable of broadcast transmissions (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 30, 26); and

said isolating router is operable to block said broadcast transmissions to said first network (Prokupets: page 1, para 4).

Regarding claim 20, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data communication system of claim 1. The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches a first network comprises at least one Ethernet network and the second network comprises at least one Ethernet network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,736 by Koenig et al.

Regarding claim 18, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data communication system of claim 14.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for fire protective signaling (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 19, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data communication system of claim 14.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for information technology equipment for fire protective signaling

(Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

REMARKS

The examiner is withdrawing finality and issuing a non-final office action to update the rejection claim 4 which previously was in error but only being under Prokupets in view of Asano. The examiner will respond to the arguments and properly include claim 4 under the same rejection as similar claim 3. The applicant is reminded that the claims are still twice rejection and are eligible for appeal back to the board.

Response to Argument

One of the central issues regarding each independent claims centers around the definition and citations for a first and second network. The Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, third edition, published in 1997, defines **network** as “n. A group of computers and associated devices that are connected by communications facilities. A network can involve permanent connects, such as cables or temporary connections made through telephone or other communication links. A network can be as small as a local area network consisting of a few computers, printers, and other devices or consist of many small and large computers distributed over a vast geographic area.”

This is important and key to the examiner's position that a network can be interpreted as a connection between a group (two) computers. As applicant has not applied any special meaning or features of the network, the examiner has interpreted the term as the generic and normal use in the art. Further, applicant argues that the architecture in using this network is the unique and

novel feature. The examiner will attempt to show the arrangement of obvious devices (i.e. network and routers) are already taught and supported by the art.

Applicant argues with respect to independent claim 1:

On page A-8 of the brief, applicant argues the interpretation of the second network in the combination of Prokupets and Asano.

On page A-9 of the brief, applicant argues the first network is unclear and where the isolating router would be implemented.

On page A10 of the brief, applicant argues the proposed combination, specifically, no reason to modify the references.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Prokupets reference (Fig. 1) shows a number of devices and workstations connected via network 20. The examiner interprets that first network of the claims to be the network 20 that connects to the devices of tags 22 and 18. The first network includes: a number of critical devices disposed within the facility taught by Prokupets in Fig. 1, tag 22 "facility protection system" and supported by the specification page 3, para 22-24, emphasis on para 24 because the fire system is a critical device within the network facility. The 'at least one first computer workstation operable coupled to said number of critical devices via said first network is the security server, tag 12 of Figure 1, supported by specification para 29. A network can be interpreted as the coupled connection between the security server (tag 12) and each or any of the devices, in the instant case the fire control system of tag 22c. This constitutes a network as a coupling of a group of devices.

In the arguments portion of the Final of 11/10/08, the second network is argued as taught by Asano. While this remains true and is most explicitly shown in Asano, the Prokupets reference does illustrate a second network. Prokupets (on page 3, para 21) gives the definition of the network (tag 20) as "represents any typical computer network, such as LAN, WAN, or Internet, in which each component in the network has an IP address."

First, Prokupets Fig. 1, teaches a second network between the Security Server (tag 12) and the HR database (tag 26) and the HR Computer System (tag 28). This meets the definition of

a network as it the group of computers (security server and HR computer system HR database) are connected to allow communication of user data. This is further supported by the specification page 5, para 36 and 37 in which “an external database, ... , in which transactions in user data are sent to/from the security server to the HR database.

Secondly, Figure 1 denotes a separate connection between the alarm monitoring client (tag 24) and central system administration client (tag 30) with the security server (tag 12). This connection between either of the two devices with the security server also reads on the term “second network” as claimed. This is supported by the specification where the security server receives events and data from each interface and when certain criteria is met, the security server notifies alarm monitoring units via output devices (page 5, para 36) or updates a transaction log for updating the administrator at system 30 (end of page 9, para 59). While the devices tagged 30 and 24 are also connected by a network denoted by tag 20, it does not state that it is the same network as the network connecting the devices of tags 22 and 18. Prokupets further teaches that data is sent to the server for logging, monitoring and mapping and that data is “routed” to the other devices (tag 24, 30, and 26, 28) via the server. This denotes and strongly teaches a second network that is connections between the server to the other entities.

Lastly, and most clearly, the Asano reference teaches a first and second network as cited in the Final office action. Asano teaches a router that isolations a first network and a second network. Asano (col. 4, lines 27-38) “enables a host having an unauthorized address to respond to a request for communication therewith from a host on another network and communicate with the requesting host...” (emphasis added). The invention allows for routing traffic and restricting traffic between the different networks (Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11), the isolating router comprising a router configured to receive and store data packets, and to forward the received data packets (Asano: col. 16, lines 58– col. 17 line 11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

The examiner interprets both a first and second network are taught by both references. While it is less explicit (taught more by functionality and definitions) in Prokupets, it is explicitly taught in Asano. The applicant never refutes this through remarks, only arguing the combination. The lacking statement in the combination only states “The Prokupets reference teaches fails to teach a router to configure to receive, store and forward data packets” and this is maintained. The

Prokupets security server performs some functions of a router but not explicitly as an isolating router as required by the claims, so the Asano reference is utilized. Further the second network is never further defined to be more than anything than include 'at least one second computer workstation' that later can be Ethernet based. The architecture itself is used to define the limitations of the 'isolating router.' This lack of distinction and definition allows the generic definition of a router above to be applied to both the Prokupets and Asano. Hopefully the definitions of the first and second network as broadly claimed can be clearly identified to features of both the Prokupets and Asano reference.

Regarding "the proposed combination" to arrive at the invention and "no reason to modify the device of Prokupets" with Asano.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Prokupets reference teaches the first and second network, first with critical devices, the second with a second workstation. While the security server acts as a router of information (Prokupets: page 2, para 10; page 5, para 31, 34, 36-37 teaches event logging, taking action based on events and storing data in the central database), the Prokupets reference teaches fails to explicitly teach a router to configure to receive, store and forward data packets.

However, in analogous art, the Asano reference teaches a router receives and stores data packets, and to forward the received data packets (Asano: col. 16, lines 58– col. 17 line 11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the invention of Prokupets to include an isolating router that processes packets as taught by Asano in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33). The motivation is to selectively enable communication and addressing between different networks for access control (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

Adding an isolating router to Prokupets would allow for data isolation between the HR database and the other devices such as the servers of tag 18a and 18c. HR database and HR Computer system are separate and data is only interfaced through the security server (tag 12). Therefore, the second network is isolated by functionality.

By adding the isolating router of Asano to the Prokupets reference, you substitute or additionally add the common functionality and detailed features of the router to the security server to allow controlled data transmission between devices (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33). The rationales of using a known technique to improve similar devices in the same way, applying a known technique to a known device ready for improve to yield predictable and similar results, combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results, and the TSM test as supported by KSR are fully supported by the combination of Prokupets with Asano. In a broader sense, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, illustrate that router access and control between two networks are easily and readily borrowed, substituted, or applied to the Prokupets reference in order to selectively enable communication and addressing between different networks for access control (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33). Both pieces of prior art are in the computer networking field, allowing data to be transmitted between devices with combination to combined. The examiner maintains that the combination of Prokupets with Asano is proper and that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would combine Prokupets with Asano.

Applicant argues with respect to dependent claim 2:

On page A-13 of the brief, applicant argues the Prokupets reference does not teach "said first network is a fire control network."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Prokupets fire control network is denoted in Fig. 1, tag 22c of the facilities protection system of tag 22 further supported by the specification, page 3, para 24 in which "fire system 22c represents a life safety system providing fire detection used in facilities such as with sensors for detecting smoke or heat, and the like." "Such systems have fire panels in the facility capable of controlling operation of system 22c. The panels each have an interface coupling the panel to the security server 12 via network 20, or a single interface may be provided to all or groups of panels." The fire system is coupled to the security server (tag 12) via the interface and this teaches the fire control network. In this independent claim, applicant has not defined in detail through claim amendments or arguments, what said fire control network is limited to or comprised of.

Applicant argues with respect to dependent claim 4:

On page A-14 of the brief, applicant argues the Koenig reference does not teach any standards relating to fire protective signaling use.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The claim reads “said first network includes a first Ethernet switch that meets one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for fire protective signaling uses and that is operable to electrically isolate said first network from said isolating router; and said isolating router meets one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for information technology equipment for fire protective signaling uses.”

The claim rejection is updated to be rejected under Prokupets in view of Asano in further view of Miyamoto in further view of Koenig.

The first network has been established and argued above as taught by Prokupets with respect to claims 1 and 2 while the isolating router is taught by Asano. The Miyamoto reference is relied upon to teach the Ethernet switch and the Koenig reference is relied upon to teach the standards limitation.

The examiner looks to applicant's specification (publication page 2, para 17) for a definition of a standards meeting device for fire protective signaling. The paragraph states “the fire control network includes a first Ethernet switch that is UL listed for fire protective signaling uses ...” While the Ethernet switch is address by Miyamoto, the examiner can only draw the conclusion that the standards meeting device is UL listed. Enter the Koenig reference, which teaches that using devices that are UL compliant can dramatically improve long-term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45). Thus the rationale that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would use UL compliant devices, which by applicant's specification definition is a standard for fire protective signaling, in order to dramatically improve long-term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45). The applicant contracts the instant specification by arguing the UL specification is unrelated to fire protective signaling.

Applicant argues with respect to dependent claim 7:

On page A-14 of the brief, applicant argues the combination does not teach “block said broadcast transmissions to said first network.”

Claim 7 states “said second network includes a corporate network, independent of said first network, which includes workstations capable of broadcast transmissions (Prokupets: page 1, para 1); and

said isolating router is operable to block said broadcast transmissions to said first network (Prokupets: page 1, para 4; Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11).”

Applicant argues the citation of page 1, para 4 does not teach blocking broadcasts. However, Prokupets teaches “it would be desirable to provide integrated monitoring and real-time response to events occurring in facilities physical environment protected by facility protection systems and data network environments of information systems, such that events occurring in facilities protection systems can cause actions at information system to protect access to data and networks.” Furthermore, “it would also be desirable to integrate the management of user and their access privileges to the facilities environment controlled by the facilities access control system with user and access privileges to the data and network environments controlled by the information systems.” Prokupets teaches the use of data protection and access privileges for accessing data which blocks users from accessing data based on their assigned privileges (Prokupets: page 7, para 44). The router component is the teaching from Asano detailed above that would act or replace the security server of Prokupets.

Applicant argues with respect to independent claim 14:

On page A-15 of the brief, applicant argues the examiner has failed to identify an first and second network connected by an IP router and on page A1-6 and A-17, there is no reason to replace the server 12 of Prokupets with the IP router of Asano.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Prokupets teaches a network that uses IP addresses (page 3, para 21). Prokupets teaches a first and second network argued and described in the response to arguments of claim 1. An IP router is a device that routes messages according to their IP address, used in source and destination addressing. The Asano reference excels at teaching this. Col. 17, lines 1-11 of Asano

teach "router is capable of delivering IP packets it receives to a network, deciding on which route to take in the delivery of IP packets and of restricting traffic of packets by authorized source and destination address. The router also stores an address pair register table and an address mapping table so that it is capable of subjecting a source address or a destination address of IP packets to translation according to the address pair register table." The important elements to the claims of an IP router are taught by the router that delivers IP packets of a network.

Applicant argues with respect to dependent claims 3, 8-13:

On page A-17 of the brief, applicant argues the Koenig reference does not teach any standards relating to fire protective signaling use.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The examiner has addressed this issue in the argument to claim 4 above.

Applicant argues with respect to independent claim 8:

On page A-18 of the brief, applicant argues the combination of Prokupets in view of Asano in further view of Miyamoto do not teach Ethernet sub-networks.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The applicant claims a first and second network but by definition a network is a connection between two or devices. While the connections and networks shown with respect to independent claim 1 are separate networks, it can also be interpreted that they are sub-networks because they are portions of a larger network (Fig. 1). With respect to the limitation that they are Ethernet sub-networks, Ethernet is defined by the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, 3rd edition as "an IEEE 802.3 standard for contention networks." Ethernet is a standard type of connection that employs certain standards for data transmission and reception. While Prokupets and Asano teach networks, neither explicitly teaches an Ethernet network. However, the Miyamoto reference teaches "a typical high-level network structure" resembles Fig. 2a. Where "LANs usually divided into subnetworks i.e. subnets, for reasons including administration and broadcast traffic isolation." "The physical network interconnections" are by "Ethernet cables" and that data can be isolated from other networks (See page 1, para 6). Para 25 further teaches that computers are connected using a "local Ethernet hub" and the router software routes

connections to the Internet. Therefore, the examiner maintains, that Miyamoto not only teaches Ethernet connections for networks and subnetworks, but reinforces the teaching that routers isolate traffic from other networks and routers send traffic between the different networks (Fig.1). The applicant argues the Miyamoto does not teach Ethernet sub-networks, ignoring the cited paragraphs and Figures that contradict applicant's assertion.

Applicant argues with respect to dependent claims 9-13; 5-6, 20; and 18-19:

On page A-20 of the brief, applicant argues the dependent claims are allowable for reasons argued earlier in the brief.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

There are no new arguments here that were not made in previous pages or arguments addressed above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R. Bruckart whose telephone number is (571) 272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeff Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2446

/Benjamin R Bruckart/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446